



COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT

17575 Peak Avenue Morgan Hill CA 95037 (408) 778-6480 Fax (408) 779-7236
Website Address: www.morgan-hill.ca.gov

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES

REGULAR MEETING

DECEMBER 14, 2010

PRESENT: Mueller, Moniz, Tanda, Koepp-Baker, Benich

ABSENT: None

LATE: None

STAFF: Interim Community Development Director (ICDD) Piasecki, Planning Manager (PM) Rowe, Senior Planner (SP) Linder, Senior Civil Engineer (SCE) Creer, Assistant Engineer (AE) Ha, and Development Services Technician (DST) Bassett

Chair Mueller called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m., inviting all present to join in reciting the pledge of allegiance to the U.S. flag.

DECLARATION OF POSTING OF AGENDA

Development Services Technician Bassett certified that the meeting's agenda was duly noticed and posted in accordance with Government Code Section 54954.2.

OPPORTUNITY FOR PUBLIC COMMENT

Chair Mueller opened, and then closed, the floor to public comment for matters not appearing on the agenda as none were in attendance indicating a wish to address such matters.

MINUTES:

November 9, 2010 **COMMISSIONERS KOEPP-BAKER AND TANDA MOTIONED TO APPROVE THE NOVEMBER 9, 2010 MINUTES WITH THE FOLLOWING REVISIONS:**

Page 11, Para 17: *(Insert)* **Dick Oliver of Alicante Estates appeared.**

THE MOTION PASSED (5-0-0-0) WITH THE FOLLOWING VOTE: AYES: UNANIMOUS; NOES: NONE; ABSTAIN: NONE; ABSENT: NONE.

**PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES
DECEMBER 14, 2010
PAGE 2**

**ORDERS OF THE
DAY**

Agenda Item 2 was moved before Item 1.

**PUBLIC
HEARINGS:**

**2) MICRO
MEASURE C
APPLICATION
MMC-10-10: ST.
JAMES-DUNN**

Direction is requested on the scoring of micro application MMC-10-10 consisting of five single family detached homes on approximately .65 acres on the northeast corner of Saint James Dr.

Rowe presented his staff report and stated that because the project is eligible for the micro application it can be handled on an administrative level.

Item No. 2 was closed.

**1) RESIDENTIAL
DEVELOPMENT
CONTROL
SYSTEM(RDCS)
PUBLIC
HEARINGS FOR
THE 2010-11
COMPETITIONS**

**APPLICANTS FOR THE NINE PROPOSED RESIDENTIAL
DEVELOPMENTS HAVE REQUESTED A BUILDING ALLOTMENT
UNDER THE CITY'S RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT CONTROL
SYSTEM, PURSUANT TO CHAPTER 18.78 OF THE MORGAN HILL
MUNICIPAL CODE**

- a) **MEASURE C, MC-10-01: WATSONVILLE-DIVIDEND:** A request for a Residential Building Allocation for Fiscal Year 2012-13. The project is a 16 unit single-family residential development on a 10.3-acre parcel located at 15200 Watsonville Road on the South side of Watsonville opposite La Alameda. (APN 779-03-137, 138 & 139)

Rowe presented his staff report.

Mueller opened the floor to public comment.

Dick Oliver of Dividend Homes appeared.

Oliver: Part A contains the criteria that determine if a property is appropriate to be developed in the city. Apparently, the criteria have recently changed which resulted in a little bit different scoring. The question really is if this property is appropriate to be developed. In the 2000 and 2002, this project scored 9.5 points. To come in now without a pre-notice to the owner that this project is undevelopable, and therefore can't compete, is unfair.

Mueller: I thought I read something about gridding in Phase 2.

Oliver: Yes, gridding is nice but it is not required.

Tanda: What is gridding?

Oliver: It is when there is a drain on both ends of a project, so there isn't a dead-end waterline. If it's blocked on one end, you can flush it out the other. That is why you get an extra point for doing it.

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES

DECEMBER 14, 2010

PAGE 3

Koepp-Baker: If this project was acceptable to be developed previously, why is it not now?

Ha: I reviewed the scoring of Part A for the previous application and it seems it was a little generous. With this project, it could not grid. There is no agreement with the adjacent property owner, which is the county, so this project would only get 1.5 points. The reason for this is because the waterline is a long, dead-end stub. It taxes the system; it does not benefit it. Regarding the sewer, to get two points, the sewer would have to front the project. In this case, there is no main along Watsonville. There is one along La Alameda, but it is a dead-end stub to serve that subdivision. A main along Watsonville would make more sense because it would tie in to the south and wouldn't require a booster station.

Moniz: Is there a criterion as to why we would or wouldn't award that half point, or is that discretionary?

Ha: That is me talking to the maintenance supervisor. They would have to extend the main, which is a strike against the project.

Mueller: There are projects all over town that have extended the main. So if this is only 16 homes, how does that tax the system?

Ha: The assumption is that the design of La Alameda was for those homes only and not for additional homes.

Mueller: But La Alameda runs from Watsonville to La Crosse, so lots of homes tie into that line.

Ha: Could you add to that system? That would need to be further analyzed. But that system ties into a booster station that goes to the east. If you have to add to the main, it's more line for us to maintain. To get the max points, you would want a main along Watsonville and then tie in to the line because then it would be sized properly. At that point, if we already had means to maintain the lines as part of our budget, it would qualify for the points. The additional line increases maintenance.

Rowe: This project requires extension of the existing line. The real question is whether this extension overtaxes the line or the sewer main. We would probably need to go back and talk to the maintenance supervisor to have that analyzed.

Moniz: What does it cost to maintain a mile of line?

Rowe: The real question is if this overtaxes the existing system.

Koepp-Baker: Could we get an answer to that before the next meeting on January 11?

Rowe: Yes.

Ha: So in this application we scored 1 point for water, 1 for sewer and 1.5 for parks;

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES

DECEMBER 14, 2010

PAGE 4

whereas previously we scored 2 points for water, 1.5 for sewer and 2 points for parks.

Mueller: I find it hard to believe that 15 units or 150 trips would tax [the road capacity of] Watsonville.

Ha: We'll look at that further.

Mueller: So we'll have all three categories re-examined.

Oliver: This is the first we have heard any comments from Public Works. In response, the line is only 500 feet, not 1,000. And also for the property to be annexed into the city the property qualified for Part A. That was a requirement.

Mueller closed the floor to public hearing.

Benich: We are spending a lot of time on this. We should give them the same number of points they received in the previous competitions, except for the schools category, which has been eliminated for everybody.

Tanda: Regarding Police and Fire, why is this project lower than any of the other projects?

Rowe: It's farther away from fire response stations. We have more accurate maps now than we did in 2003/04, but it scored the same as it did in 2004.

Tanda: Does that mean that homes on Easy Street if they competed now, would not get the points for fire suppression and police response?

Rowe: Correct.

Mueller closed discussion of the item.

b) **MEASURE C, MC-10-02: HALE-SIGNATURE:** A request for a Residential Building Allocation for Fiscal Year 2012-13. The project is a 108 lot single family residential development on 30.3 acres located on the east side of Hale Avenue and southerly extension of Saffron Drive. (APN 764-09-012)

Rowe presented his staff report.

Moniz: Regarding the "Safe Paths to Schools," is that a consistent response?

Linder: The easements do not exist to be able to install sidewalks along Old Monterey. But the applicant did commit to make improvements to the Morgan Hill Unified School District (MHUSD) within the Urban Service Area (USA).

Mueller opened the floor to public comment.

Joe Ziwitsky appeared on behalf of the project.

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES

DECEMBER 14, 2010

PAGE 5

Ziwitsky: Under item 3, it says that a project gets points for committing to \$845 per point per unit. We committed to paying \$534,600 to create safe access for schools. We only received four points, so does that mean we're only going to be paying \$356,400? We need clarification.

Rowe: Four points are awarded if the improvements are made. An additional two points are awarded if the safety improvements are within a $\frac{3}{4}$ mile proximity to a school.

Ziwitsky: I don't interpret it that way. My understanding is that four points are given if it's anywhere within the city. Then two points are added if the safe path is within $\frac{3}{4}$ of a mile of a school.

Mueller: You can get credit for a safe walking path, but you can only do that if the easements are in place or you bring in an agreement when you file.

Ziwitsky: My understanding is that we would do these improvements and we would do them near the school. That is why we committed to this. We're okay with the \$346,400, if that's what we're told.

Benich: I think we should take the broad interpretation; otherwise we're slighting our own community.

Mueller: I think we should take this under consideration for clarification.

Mueller closed the public hearing.

Benich: On page 9, item 2.d, I have an issue with staff. Applicant did get the full two points, but Staff keeps stating that the project needs to have a "safe continuous route" but that is not required for a high school. Years ago we decided that it was only for elementary schools because we assumed that high school students either drive or are capable of crossing the street.

Mueller: I disagree. We changed it to being that high school students can cross an arterial, but elementary and middle schools cannot.

Benich: Read the criterion. It's not stated there so I maintain I'm correct. Also, I think they should get another point for Circulation Efficiency, item 1.f. Why was H singled out from the other streets?

Creer: That section of street was singled out because it didn't meet the criterion. It created a short block because it was 248 feet, which was less than the requirement.

Benich: H and F look the same. The difference can only be by inches.

Creer: It's feet, and in past experience it has been based on the actual feet.

Tanda: It is my understanding that the issue of four points versus six has to do with the receipt of a letter from the property owner regarding an easement. So if the

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES

DECEMBER 14, 2010

PAGE 6

letter is received, then would they qualify for the additional two points?

Linder: It was received after the application deadline.

Rowe: Oct. 1 is the statutory deadline for the competition. To allow additional information after that time is unfair to the other applicants. We did agree at the last meeting that there were two projects that had submitted information by the deadline, so we would allow their letters.

Tanda: Why has staff allowed for more points than the applicant has asked for?

Linder: That happened in two of my projects where the applicant simply did not fill in a section, but the applicant did not argue with those points.

Mueller closed discussion of the item.

- c) **MEASURE C, MC-10-03: DIANA-SHERIMAR:** A request for a Residential Building Allocation for Fiscal Year 2012-13. The project is a 91 lot single family residential development on 34.35 acres located on the south side of Diana Avenue with interior streets connecting to Bradford Way and Jasmine Way. (APN 728-18-012, 728-19-001, 002, 003, 728-20-038, 728-20-037)

Rowe: We will look at item 3.b regarding paths to the schools for all the projects.

Moniz: Is the scope of the improvement plans Main Ave only—not Condit?

Linder: That is correct. There are no easements on Condit.

Mueller opened the floor to public comment.

Ray Panek of KB Homes of Northern California appeared.

Panek: This project has been around for a number of years. We have our first phase of architectural and site review in plan check now. We are looking forward to proceeding during the next 2½ to 3 yrs. We are happy about the 6 points we received in the Build it Green category. We are proud of our record in that area.

Mueller closed discussion of the item.

- d) **MEASURE C, MC-10-04: MONTEREY-DYNASTY:** A request for a Residential Building Allocation for Fiscal Year 2012-13. The proposed 129 unit townhouse and condominium project is located on a 7.3 acre site on the west side of Monterey Road, approximately 780 feet north of the Watsonville Road and Monterey Road intersection. (APN 767-23-026 & 029)

Rowe: This is the final phase of a project that has competed twice before and consists of 29 units. We are recommending adjustments to the scores for Parks & Paths, and for Open Space.

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES
DECEMBER 14, 2010
PAGE 7

Linder: There was one error made under Lot Layout where the score should have gone up by two points but it went up by four. It should be 13 points instead of 15.

Benich: This project is for 129 units and 100 of those are rental units. Under RDCS, does each of those count as 1 unit?

Linder: Yes, you can think of it as counting kitchens.

Rowe: But 100 of those have already been allotted. This is only for 29.

Tanda: It appears that this site does not have enough parking. Has that been resolved?

Linder: No, 19 of the spaces are on the street and that is not allowed. They will have to resolve that as we go through entitlements.

Mueller opened the floor to public comment.

Bill McClintock of MH Engineering appeared on behalf of Monterey-Dynasty.

McClintock: We are in agreement with staff regarding the 4 points that have been added. Regarding the parking standard, it was our understanding that we could use street parking in the count if it's within 150 feet. We will correct that on the next submittal.

Benich: I took off one point under Parks and Paths. One of the barbecue areas is right on the parking strip behind Building B. It should be near the center of the subdivision. So I don't think that is very good planning and should have a point removed. Also on Natural and Environmental, page 62, there are some existing cedar trees. They received no points for that. It seems when a developer wants to save trees, even if they're not significant, that is good. I would say that deserves a half point. On page 64, I had a problem with staff scoring. No points are being given for pre-wiring for solar. We should encourage that type of development.

Koepp-Baker: I think that deserves points too.

Linder: Under our tree ordinance, non-indigenous trees do not qualify as significant trees.

Moniz: You're saying that cedar is not California native, so it doesn't get a point?

Koepp-Baker: I am of the mindset that a tree is a tree, and if it's a good quality we should award a half-point to preserve it.

Rowe: In this case, the code requires the tree to be indigenous, so we can't award points. Regarding the solar, you only get the points if you provide the solar not just if you wire for it.

Benich: During post review, we should consider splitting the points—one for solar

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES

DECEMBER 14, 2010

PAGE 8

and one for water.

Mueller: We can't award points for solar in this competition. That would have to be for future competitions. We would also need to look at state requirements, which are undergoing change.

Linder: And the trees?

Koepp-Baker: We should give them at least a half point.

Benich: I agree.

Moniz: I don't.

Mueller called for a break at 8:24 and reconvened at 8:32 pm.

- e) **MEASURE C, MC-10-05: WALNUT GROVE-UCP:** A request for a Residential Building Allocation for Fiscal Year 2012-13. The project is a 49 lot single family residential development on 8.89 acres located at the northwest corner of Walnut Grove Drive and San Pedro Avenue. (APN 817-11-002)

Mueller opened the floor to public comment.

Scott Schilling of Benchmark Properties, a division of Union Community Partners (UCP), appeared and stated that the project is a superior project with an especially nice layout.

Michael Cady of UCP appeared: We're supportive of the staff recommendations. Regarding Public Facilities item 2.c, we want to point out that all of the storm drains are in public right-of-ways.

Mueller opened the item to discussion.

Benich: Under Open Space, item 1.a, the applicant says that they propose using open space along Walnut Grove ten feet in excess of what is required, but staff gave no points for that. It seems it's a good thing and should be rewarded. Staff's comment is that it's a collector street.

Linder: Because of this project's proximity to the freeway, it is in essence required as a mitigation measure and not so much an option.

Rowe: The criterion is not applicable to collector streets, which is what Walnut Grove Dr is. It's only applicable to freeway or arterial streets.

Benich: I would give them one point for that. Also under Public Facilities, I thought we previously discussed that even if storm drains are on private drives, that is a good thing because then they're maintained by the project.

Mueller: The difference is that this project isn't proposing to maintain the storm

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES
DECEMBER 14, 2010
PAGE 9

drains. The other larger project did.

Ha: It is a good thing to be private. In looking at this project, there are two segments that would meet city standards. There are segments that do not meet city standards and would require reconfiguration. But we could look at this again and probably grant some points.

Mueller: But if we're asking them to make a change then it doesn't meet the criteria as proposed and they don't qualify for the point now. This is a competition.

Ha: They do partly meet the criteria.

Benich: But it says if it's at a point deemed acceptable to the Public Works director then it could qualify for the point, and I think that's what you're going to review.

Ha: Correct.

Mueller: I have a real problem with this project not doing a park, and there is nothing close by that these people can use. They're being given a point because that's the way the criterion is written but this is something we're going to have to look at in post review because it's a major flaw. The closest public park is Diana and that is across Dunne.

Schilling: We did create a lot of open space and the project is close to a public school.

Mueller: But the School District does not allow the general public to use their facilities on an open basis or during the school day.

Mueller closed discussion of the item.

- f) **MEASURE C, MC-10-06: W. EDMUNDSON-UCP:** A request for a Residential Building Allocation for Fiscal Year 2012-13. The project is a 29 lot single family residential development on 8.11 acres located on the south side of W. Edmundson Avenue opposite Olympic Drive (APN 767-10-013, 014)

Rowe presented his staff report.

Mueller opened the floor to public comment.

Scott Schilling appeared on behalf of the project.

Schilling: This project does have a great park across the street and is very well located with the recreation center nearby.

Moniz: Under Natural and Environmental, why weren't any points given for limiting the retaining walls?

Rowe: The project is proposing sound walls along 3 out of 4 lots along W.

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES

DECEMBER 14, 2010

PAGE 10

Edmundson, and that does not minimize the use of sound walls.

Moniz: What would be a good example of minimizing sound walls?

Rowe: Many projects put their open space along the frontage so that the sound walls aren't necessary and also some projects have homes that front to the street with parking in the rear.

Vince Burgos appeared on behalf of UCP and stated that the landscape buffer in the front is as wide as the lots.

Benich: Why didn't you put the BMR unit on lot 9 where the BBQ is, and the BBQ where lot 9 is so that it could be more centrally located to all the homes?

Burgos: We were trying to transition between the bigger lots.

Mueller closed discussion of the item.

- g) **MEASURE C, MC-10-07: PIAZZA-UCP:** A request for a Residential Building Allocation for Fiscal Year 2012-13. The project is a 14 unit single family residential development on 2.56 acres located on the west side of Piazza Way south of West Edmundson Avenue. (APN 767-21-045)

Benich: This project was marked down three points. Which category did they come from?

Linder: I don't have it listed as a reduction. The project was erroneously given two points under Landscaping item 4 because they don't meet that criterion. Also, they received a point for being in the downtown area, but that was incorrect.

Moniz: Under Livable Communities, why didn't the project get two points even though they committed to porches, balconies, etc?

Rowe: It says the project didn't commit to provide the required architectural features and based on the drawings doesn't meet the stated criteria. We can go back and look at it again.

Mueller opened the floor to public comment.

Scott Schilling appeared on behalf of the project and stated that it's very well located and will complete the street.

Mueller: Is that a drive aisle on Lots 1, 2 and 3?

Burgos: It's a private drive, not a driveway that will provide access to all three lots. We designed it that way because of what was recommended for the PanCal site.

Mueller: I'm not a big fan of the way that drive aisle feeds into the next project. Also, there is a huge elevation difference, something like three feet, between the natural grade and Piazza way. That's going to be a big challenge but it's something

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES

DECEMBER 14, 2010

PAGE 11

we can deal with in the entitlement process.

Benich: This reminds me of the first project we looked at tonight—the senior project. Neither project got points because they didn't have direct connection to a park. If a project is willing to put in a crosswalk across Edmundson to connect to a park, then that is a good thing.

Mueller: I have no problem with what you're suggesting, but I think it falls into a different category. And I think the criterion was set up to provide an additional access into the facilities.

Koepp-Baker: I think anything that provides a safe crosswalk is a good idea.

Tanda: I have a question as to why they didn't get a point for J, under Circulation. UCP received a point on one of their projects for an agreement with the adjacent PanCal property. It's the same developer. So why didn't they both get a point for this project, which is also adjacent to PanCal?

Rowe: Both projects have to go forward in order for the second access. If it were to proceed independently, it couldn't provide the second access.

Creer: Piazza Way is already built. The other project committed to extend that section of street across the PanCal project. In the Piazza Way project, even if they built the stub street across PanCal, they would still have to build the continuous street across their other project, which they don't have allocations for, in order to make the continuous loop. And they didn't make that commitment.

Tanda: So the one to the east is already built out?

Creer: Yes.

Mueller opened the floor to public comment.

Scott Gomez, the owner of the home adjacent to Lot 12 appeared.

Gomez: I just want to make sure that I am kept informed of future development because it affects me. Also, I think the crosswalk idea is a great idea. One concern I have is the sharing of the front yard. Right now, I have a common wall with that property. I want to make sure that aesthetically, I don't wind up with a sound wall or something right next to me.

Mueller: You will receive notices of all future meetings.

Rowe: Staff is going to review Livable Communities item B.6.a which deals with porches and balconies.

Mueller closed discussion of the item.

- h) **MEASURE C, MC-10-08: DEL MONTE-BLACKWELL:** A request for a Residential Building Allocation for Fiscal Year 2012-13. The project is a

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES

DECEMBER 14, 2010

PAGE 12

42 lot single family residential development on 8.3 acres located on the east side of Hale Avenue and southerly extension of Del Monte Avenue south of Llagas Road. (APN 764-21-027, 764-20-074)

Rowe presented his staff report.

Benich: I was surprised to see the BMRs so clustered. We have always made a point of distributing the BMRs throughout the project. I think a point should be deducted for that.

Rowe: That could be determined as something unacceptable by the Planning Commission and the applicant could be asked to intersperse them more evenly throughout the project when they submit for site review.

Mueller: I really feel this project did not do a good job of planning for the connection with future subdivisions.

Linder: I did score the project down for not making that connection under 1.f of Lot Layout and also for the fact that half of this project's detention pond is on that other parcel.

Mueller opened the floor to public comment.

Greg Blackwell appeared. We would like the Planning Commission to consider rescoring in three areas: 1) Page 40, private transition to existing neighborhoods. On the north side we have an existing R3, ours is an R1- 4,500. On the south we have an R1-7,000 project. We dealt with the transition by putting the BMR's along the boundary with the R3. On the south edge, we have kept a 1:1 ratio of unit counts with the R1-7000 neighborhood. We believe we have met that criterion and should be given the point back. 2) Item B.f, found on page 40, relates to setbacks and neighborhood circulation. We're not sure where this requirement exists in the criterion. If it did, we would have addressed it. It hasn't been a requirement in the past. Our project has one of the highest variations in side setbacks of any in the competition. We have no repeated pairs of setbacks. 3) Other projects in this competition have all private drives. Past projects have allowed private drives and the zoning here allows them, so we believe we should be awarded a point there.

Koepp-Baker: What is your approach for students walking to Britton, because you put in for the point and it was denied?

Burgos: It goes down Del Monte, then along Wright, and over to the school.

Linder: That adjustment was made earlier.

Koepp-Baker: Okay.

Mueller closed the floor to public comment.

Benich: I think the applicant is correct about transitions and setbacks and should be given points under Lot Layout.

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES
DECEMBER 14, 2010
PAGE 13

Moniz: The zoning is correct. I don't know what else the project could do. It's a tough site.

Mueller: I agree with staff on this one and I don't see consensus.

Benich: On page 62 under Natural and Environmental, the item giving two points for solar, for exterior landscape lighting and an irrigation control box, seems far too generous. I think that should be looked at as a post review.

Mueller closed discussion of the item.

- i) **MEASURE C, MC-10-09: MURPHY-CHELLINO:** A request for a Residential Building Allocation for Fiscal Year 2012-13. The project is an eight lot single family residential development on 2.34 acres located on the east side of Murphy Avenue approximately 610 feet south of East Dunne Avenue. (APN 817-19-001)

Rowe presented his staff report: New letters from the applicant were received just today. The criterion deals with standard response times. We have fire response maps for the project area in question. The response maps only show 2-, 4- and 6-minute response time categories. There is no category for 5 minutes. Based on the maps we have from the fire department, it is not within a 6-minute response time of the El Toro station; it is only within a 6-minute response time of the Cal Fire station. And under the Circulation Efficiency, as we understand it, this project is basically a cul de sac street and therefore doesn't provide a looping pattern.

Benich: I question staff on the setbacks, under item B.1.a on pg 11. The applicant agrees to 10 feet in excess of the standard setback. Staff's comment is that there is no assurance of the fence wall. What does the statement mean?

Rowe: The only way to guarantee a setback in excess of the code is to provide an easement on the excess portion. The site plan does not show any easements along Murphy. Often those areas have later been fenced in by homeowners. That was the basis why staff didn't recommend a point.

Moniz: Is that a consistent approach and has been treated that way in other projects? If I'm going to provide an additional ten foot setback, does it require an easement?

Linder: It's a very small project. I don't know if we've had a like situation. But we do have a mechanism where that could be addressed.

Koepp-Baker: So the easement is the missing criterion under Open Space, item B.1.d?

Linder: In that instance, I believe it is because the project does not have direct access to a park.

Moniz: If a project says it commits to being prewired and pre-plumbed for

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES

DECEMBER 14, 2010

PAGE 14

alternative energy sources but it doesn't identify what those are, is that why it didn't get the points? Did they provide a Build It Green Checklist identifying those items?

Rowe: Yes, they did.

Moniz: So they should be given the point.

Mueller opened the floor to public hearing.

Bill McClintock of MH Engineering appeared: We were hoping this would be heard Thursday because the applicant had a family emergency. I would like to ask for consideration on three areas: 1) Under Orderly and Contiguous, I drove the distance to the CDF station. It took 5.5 minutes, but I wasn't able to go through the light as an EMT would be able to, so I think it would be within the 6-minute response time. 2) Under Circulation Efficiency, we have "allowed for" the looping pattern for circulation. It is very logical that this street is going to loop back to San Pedro, so we believe we have met that requirement. 3) On the issue of open space, we did commit to the ten foot setback. The drawings don't show that, but we have plenty of room, and we would provide for that.

Rowe: We have been directed to look at that again.

McClintock: On Natural and Environmental, we filled this application out quickly, so we used the language from the Measure C, and said that we would pre-wire and pre-plumb, as stated. We would provide the connections as needed to pass design review. So we are asking for those points also.

Benich: Was an arborist report required to be submitted? It seems they're committing to keeping a lot of trees.

Mueller: But without an arborist report there is no way to determine if they're significant trees.

Mueller: So items to review are the latest response time maps, the landscaping and wiring, and the setbacks in the front.

Mueller closed discussion of the item.

ANNOUNCEMENTS/ COMMISSIONER IDENTIFIED ISSUES

Announcements: The meeting for Thursday, Dec. 16 is cancelled because we were able to finish tonight. The next meeting will be Tuesday, January 11, 2011.

CITY COUNCIL REPORTS

None.

ADJOURNMENT

Noting that there was no further business for the Planning Commission at this meeting, Chair Mueller adjourned the meeting at 9:51p.m.

**PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES
DECEMBER 14, 2010
PAGE 15**

MINUTES RECORDED AND TRANSCRIBED BY:

ELIZABETH BASSETT, Development Services Technician

R:\PLANNING\WP51\MINUTES\PCminutes\2010\12 DEC\121410 Final Minutes.doc